A SHORT VIEW OF THE Chief Points IN CONTROVERSY Between the REFORMED CHURCHES And the CHURCH of *ROME.*

IN

Two LETTERS to the Duke of *Bouillon*, upon his turning PAPIST.

Written by the Reverend *PETER DU MOULIN*, Professor of Divinity in the University of *Sedan.*

Newly translated out of the FRENCH *Copy, which was never Printed.*

LONDON, Printed for *Benjamin Tooke*, at the Ship in St. *Pauls* Church-Yard 1686.

702.e.27
1-3

A SHORT VIEW OF THE Chief Points IN CONTROVERSY Between the REFORMED CHURCHES And the CHURCH of *ROME.*

IN

Two LETTERS to the Duke of *Bouillon*, upon his turning PAPIST.

Written by the Reverend *PETER DU MOULIN*, Professor of Divinity in the University of *Sedan.*

Newly translated out of the FRENCH *Copy, which was never Printed.*

LONDON, Printed for *Benjamin Tooke*, at the Ship in St. *Pauls* Church-Yard 1686.

To the Honourable

Sir *NORTON KNATCHBUL*,

Knight and Baronet.

Honourable Sir,

THeſe Letters written fifty years ago to reduce the Duke of Bouillon *to the Proteſtant Religion which he had forſaken, never were put to the Preſs, for Fear of provoking that great Lord to confute them with Arguments of Power, againſt which thoſe of Truth and Learning too often*

ten

ten cannot ſtand. That they now come out in Engliſh, *the Church of* England *is obliged, Sir, to you, who having by your diligent Search made your ſelf Owner of a fair Manuſcript of the ſame, were pleaſed to beſtow it upon me, the Authors Son; adding your Requeſt, which to me is a Command, that I would tranſlate it into* Engliſh, *and give it to the Publick. I have now obeyed your Order, which I could not have done in a more ſeaſonable Conjuncture, and I cannot in Duty but return this*

this Tranſlation to the bountiful Giver of the Original. Sir, you have by your excellent Labours already publiſht, ſhewn to the World how well you can match hearty Piety with eminent Learning. Now you are pleaſed to give another Inſtance of your Affection to both, by procuring the ſetting forth theſe following Treatiſes. Short indeed they are, but as compact with the Sinews of Reaſon and Learning, as any that ever came from the Study of that ſtrong Champion of Gods Cauſe. May God be glorified by it, his

Truth

Truth aſſerted, his Oppoſers converted, and your Zeal for Gods Truth and Glory be rewarded by God, and imitated by men. So prayeth

SIR,

Your true Honourer, and
moſt humble Servant.

PETER DU MOULIN.

The

THE FIRST EPISTLE.

MY LORD,

UPON hearing the Report that you purpoſe to change your Religion, I continued a long time doubtful whether I ſhould write to Your Grace about it. For, being hardly perſwaded that ſuch a thought could come into your mind, I was afraid to be offenſive to Your Grace by my Miſtruſt. But now, ſeeing that Report to continue and increaſe, I could hold no longer from imparting my thoughts to Your Grace upon that Subject, being inferiour to none in Fidelity and Affection to your Service.

You were inſtructed, My Lord, from your Infancy, by an Excellent Father, and a Virtuous Mother, in a Re-

ligion, of which you have learned to fear God, and ſerve him according to his Word. In that Religion, if you had met with ſome Scruple, you ought, at the leaſt, to have heard both the Parties, and not have taken counſel onely of the Adverſaries. This is plain tempting of God, who being thereby juſtly provoked, blindeth the Spirit of thoſe that ſeek occaſions to turn from his Service.

Had Your Grace done me that Honour to acquaint me with your Doubts, I might have eaſily ſhewed you, that the *Roman* Religion is altogether contrary to the Word of God. That they celebrate every day a propitiatory Sacrifice for the Redemption of Souls, other than the Death of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. That the Communion of the Cup, expreſly commanded in Scripture, is denied to the Laity. That the People ſay Prayers to God which they do not underſtand, and the Publick Service is performed in a Language unknown to them, contrary to the expreſs Prohibition of the Apoſtle. That the Trinity is repreſented in carved Stone and Picture, and the Adoration of Images

1 *Cor.* 14. 16.

Images is enjoyned by many Popes and new Councels, contrary to Gods expreſs Prohibition in the Second Commandment; Which was taken away from the Law of God in the Offices and Breviaries, that the People might not ſee it. That Bones and Relicks of Saints are adored. That by the Doctrine of their Purgatory God is made to burn the Souls of his Children for Sins fully pardoned, and for which Jeſus Chriſt hath wholly ſatisfied, and that not to mend the Sinners, but to ſatisfie his Juſtice. That the Pope, without any Authority from the Word of God, taketh upon him to be Succeſſor to St. *Peter* in the Apoſtleſhip, and in the Primacy over the Univerſal Church. To defend which Primacy, Epiſtles and Decretals of the Antient Biſhops of *Rome* were forged, and many Books and ſuppoſititious Paſſages, the falſhood whereof we ſhew by invincible Proofs.

In Decrees, Councels, Canons, and Principal Authors of the *Roman* Church, the Pope is called God, and the Divine Majeſty, having all Power in Heaven and Earth: By which Pow-

er he fetcheth Souls out of Purgatory, puts ſuch as he pleaſeth in the Liſt of the Saints by Canonizing them, giveth Pardons of Sins of two or three thouſand years, giveth and taketh away Kingdoms, diſpenſeth with Oaths made unto God, diſſolveth Marriages lawfully contracted, boaſting that he cannot err in the Faith, and that he hath Power to add new Articles to the Creed, to be Judge above Scripture, and to alter that which God hath inſtituted in his Word. Of theſe I could bring to Your Grace a thouſand Proofs, drawn from the Decrees and Councels of Popes, and from Publick Experience.

The Pope boaſteth that he hath a Treaſure in which he layeth up all the Overplus of the Penitential Works of the Saints, and diſtributeth them unto others by his Indulgences, and makes multitudes to travel two or three hundred Leagues to get the Remiſſion of their Sins, which is offered to them at home *gratis* by the Doctrine of the Goſpel. If a Rich man dieth, who hath given any thing to the Church, he hath many private Maſſes, Obits, and

and Suffrages for his Money. But never any private Maſs is ſung for a Beggar, or one that hath given nothing.

In the *Roman* Church, departed Saints are prayed to, of whom Holy Scripture ſaith, that they know not the Hearts of men, and whoſe Invocation hath neither Command nor Example, nor Promiſe in the Word of God.

I am told that Your Grace hath given ear to *Capucins*, who have for their Patron and Author of their Order St. *Francis*; whoſe Life, if you had read, as our Adverſaries themſelves have publiſh'd it, you might think that it was purpoſely written to defame him. There you may find how he preach'd unto Birds; that being ſtark naked, he embraced a Woman made of Snow to repreſs his Heats; that he took up again the Lice that fell down from his Garments, and many the like Feats. Theſe *Capucins*, as other *Monks*, boaſt that they doe Works of *Supererogation*, that is, better and more perfect Works than God hath commanded in his Law; For which therefore they look for a

degree of Glory in Paradiſe above other Saints, who had attained to no greater Perfection than to fulfil the Law of God perfectly, who thereby have not got any greater Reward than Eternal Life.

If by the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church you are obliged to get Eternal Life by your Merits, inſtead of putting your whole truſt in Gods Mercy, through Jeſus Chriſt, you ſhall never enjoy any Peace of Conſcience, ſeeing that the moſt righteous Perſons have great Defects, and ſtand in need of Gods Pardon. Good works indeed are neceſſary to Salvation, not from any merit in them, but as the onely means preſcribed by God to attain the the Kingdom of Heaven.

One of the great Diſeaſes of the *Roman* Church is, that a Sinner, after he hath confeſs'd his Sins to a Prieſt, receiveth from him the Pardon of them: A Sinner forgiveth another Sinner Offences committed againſt God; as if a Felon did forgive another Felon Crimes committed againſt the King. Thereby a man makes himſelf a Judge in Gods Cauſe. A Prieſt takes upon

upon him to be Judge of Sins which he knoweth not, for he knoweth not the Thoughts and the Affections of the Heart, in which Sin doth chiefly consiſt. Neither doth he know the truth of the Sinners Repentance, without which there is no Pardon. Indeed faithful Paſtors have received of Chriſt the Power to remit Sins, as touching the Eccleſiaſtical Penalty and Cenſure of the Church, and to reconcile the Sinner excluded from the Communion, to the Church : But you would be much diſappointed if you thought that the Pardon given you by a Prieſt doth exempt you from anſwering for your Actions before Gods Judgment Seat. For when the King forgives a Felon, he doth not exempt him from being judged by that great Judge.

Can a man that feareth God, and to whom God hath left ſome liberty of Judgement, read without horrour the *Cauteles* and Rubricks of the Maſs in the beginning of the Miſſal which the Prieſt hath upon the Altar? Whereby Proviſion is made againſt the inconveniencies that may happen to the Conſecrated Hoſt, when it happens

that Mice have gnawn the Maſs-God, or when a Beaſt hath devoured it, or when the Wind hath carried it away, or when the Prieſt or a ſick perſon hath vomited it. Can ye find in your heart to worſhip a God that may be ſtollen, or eaten by Beaſts, or blown away by the Wind, and that being fallen cannot raiſe himſelf? How many times doth Scripture ſay, That Jeſus Chriſt gave Bread to his Diſciples, and that we break and eat Bread in the Lords Supper? That Bread is called the Body of Chriſt, as it is in remembrance of him. In the ſame manner, as in the next line the Cup is called the New Teſtament, becauſe it is the Sign and the Memorial of it; Therefore the Apoſtles did not worſhip it. The *Roman* Church holds that Jeſus Chriſt did communicate in the Holy Euchariſt with his Diſciples. All Parties agree that it follows from the Doctrine of that Church that Jeſus Chriſt did eat himſelf, and had his Head and his Feet in his Mouth. The Goſpel tells us, that in that Holy Action the Devil entred into *Judas*: Can ye believe that Jeſus Chriſt and the Devil entred together into him? To

Luke 22. 19, 20.

To ſtrengthen theſe Errours, the ſixth Chapter of St. *Johns* Goſpel is impertinently alleged, in which the Lord Jeſus ſpeaks of *giving his Fleſh to eat*; for Pope *Innocent* the III, and after him a multitude of Doctors have determined, that in that Chapter the Euchariſt is not meant at all, and that theſe words of *giving his Fleſh to eat*, muſt be underſtood of a Spiritual eating by Faith. There Jeſus Chriſt ſpeaks to the *Capernaïtes*, to whom he promiſeth to give his Fleſh for their meat, but he never gave them the Euchariſt. He ſpeaks to them of a manner of Eating neceſſary to Salvation, and without which none can be ſaved, ſaying, *Except ye eat the Fleſh of the Son of man there is no Life in you.* John 6. 53. Now many are ſaved without receiving the Euchariſt, as the converted Thief, crucified with Chriſt, and *John* the Baptiſt, and many Martyrs. And Jeſus Chriſt declareth, that by Eating and Drinking he underſtands Believing, when he ſaith, *He that cometh to me ſhall never hunger, and he that believeth on me ſhall never thirſt.* v. 35. Wherefore he warneth them, that *the words* v. 63.

which

which he ſaid unto them, were Spirit and Life.

It is acknowledged by all, that many Prieſts of the *Roman* Church are ill-Livers; yet it is the Doctrine of that Church, that a Prieſt, who hath been wallowing all Night in a Debauch, hath the power in the Morning to make a God with five words, and hath him in his power. I muſt alſo humbly beſeech your Grace to conſider, that the Councel of *Trent* declareth it to be the Tenet of the *Roman* Church, generally believed, that Sacraments are Null if the Prieſt hath no Intention to Conſecrate; which Intention is preſumed but by Conjecture, and none can be certain of it, ſo that the People adore an Hoſt not knowing whether it be conſecrated, which is an Adoration at a venture. Neither can any in the *Roman* Church be certain whether he be baptized, for none knoweth the Intention of him that baptizeth, nor that of him that gave him Orders.

Theſe things, my Lord, I touch ſummarily, of which the Proofs are eaſie, but too long for a Letter. To diſ-

diſguiſe theſe Truths unto Your Grace; I am told, that you have been perſwaded to read the Invectives of *Barklay*, in which Scripture is hardly alledged; and *Gualtiers* Chronicle, which is but a web of falſe paſſages of ſome ſuppoſititious Books (which are not received by the Learned of the *Roman* Church) or Calumnies imputed unto us, and ſuch things as we never thought on.

If, upon thoſe falſe Paſſages and Calumnies Your Grace had been pleaſed to conſult with ſome of our Side, expert in ſuch Matters, they would have made you ſee evidently the falſhood of them. The like I ſay of ſome paſſages of Fathers ſhewed unto Your Grace, moſt of them taken out of forged Writings, whoſe falſhood is acknowledged by our Adverſaries. We have Fathers only as they were copied out of Manuſcripts that were found in Monaſteries, written by *Monks*, who have falſified them, and whoſe falſe dealing is diſcovered by the diverſity of the Copies, of which I could ſhew you many Inſtances, if I had the Honour to converſe with

with Your Grace about that Subject. But God hath not permitted our Adverſaries to bring to an end that Enterprize of corrupting all the Fathers; for numberleſs Paſſages are found in them which bear witneſs unto the Truth: For which the Doctors of the *Roman* Church blame them very often, and give them many ill words.

But, becauſe that Diſcourſe might grow too to great a length, I do only refer Your Grace to a Paper by it ſelf a * Compariſon of the Lords Supper with the Maſs, that you may know what horrible alteration was made in the Lords Inſtitution, and that you may know that by going to Maſs you cannot be ſaved. You (I ſay) My Lord, who have been favoured with ſo many Bleſſings of God, who have had an Holy and Vertuous Education, and have a thouſand Obligations to your Illuſtrious Lady Mother, whoſe days are likely now to be ſhortned with anguiſh and ſorrow.

* Which the Reader ſhall find in the ſecond Chapter of this Authors Anatomy of the Maſs.

God hath given to Your Grace in this City * a Faithful People, heartily devoted to your Service, which have built your Town, and fortified it with their

* *Sedan.*

their hard Labour, and have not been ſparing of their Lives and means to defend this State when it was in danger. They are a People whom God hath gathered from many places and ſheltered under your ſhadow, committing them to your keeping. The Subſiſtence of this little State of yours, compaſſed about with Mighty States, depends, next to God, upon the Fidelity of the Inhabitants, and their Love to their Sovereign. Think you what Heart-breaking Sorrow it will be to that poor People, when they ſee Your Grace going to Maſs. What Diſſipation, what Deſolation ſhall you ſee ere long in your City, when the Holy Scripture ſhall be baniſh'd from your Houſe? when, inſtead of the pure Service of God, the Service of Images ſhall be eſtabliſhed, Beads, *Agnus Dei's*, and ſprinklings of Holy Water? When, inſtead of a Few Paſtors, you ſhall have Herds of Fryars ſowing Diſcord continually among your Subjects? When Eccleſiaſtical Goods ſhall be no more in your diſpoſing, and the *Roman* Clergy muſt have again that which your Predeceſſors had juſtly

juſtly taken from them, whereby your Revenues ſhall ſuffer a great Diminution? When all the Eccleſiaſtical and Matrimonial Cauſes ſhall be no more under the Juriſdiction of your Officers, but muſt be tried at *Chalons* or *Rheims*, ſo that you ſhall be no more Maſter at home? When inſtead of Subjects, altogether depending upon your Authority, you ſhall have *Jeſuits* and *Capucins* about you, having a ſtrict Intelligence with thoſe of *Bruxels*, whence Jealouſies and Fears will ariſe greatly noiſome to your State.

I could repreſent to Your Grace many Conſiderations to make you apprehend that by this Action you will ruin your Affairs, even in this World, and loſe the Love of thoſe that have been your principal Honour and Support, that hereby you will pull up the roots of your Reputation, Honour and Greatneſs, fill with Grief and Confuſion your deareſt Relations, and draw upon you the Contempt of Perſons of both Religions. For even the greateſt men of the *Roman* Church in *France*, that govern themſelves by Humane Prudence, ſay, that you take your mea-

your Meaſures amiſs, and cannot believe that ever you will take that Reſolution.

But the worſt conſequence of it is, that thereby you will loſe your Soul. For you have a great Account to give unto God, who knoweth the Hearts, who is juſt and terrible, and will not dally with thoſe that dally with him. I have poured forth, and pour ſtill for your Grace Prayers before God, & Sighs without number; neither am I without hope that God will be merciful unto you. One thing at leaſt, My Lord, let me crave at your hands, that if you have any Scruples & Doubts about your Religion, you will be pleaſed to defer your final Reſolution, till being come to this Town, you may hear the two Parties, and till we may ſpeak to ſome Doctors of the *Roman* Church in your Preſence. And I may be bold to promiſe to Your Grace to make you acknowledge that you have been poſſeſs'd with Calumnies againſt us, that both the Tenets of the *Roman* Church, and Ours, have been miſ-repreſented to Your Grace, and that *Gaultiers* Paſſages are falſe and forged.

This,

This, if I cannot obtain of Your Grace by my moſt humble Requeſt, yet ſo much comfort at leaſt I ſhall have, that I have diſcharged my Conſcience. But if I be ſo unfortunate as to loſe your Grace's Favour for ſpeaking the truth to you; it will be well for me that I have but few days to live in this World, which I will paſs away in ſorrow, tho' in hope to have them ended by Death, when it ſhall pleaſe God to receive me into his reſt. And what Sorrow ſoever may exerciſe me in my Life, I will never leave praying for your Proſperity and Salvation, as reſolved to be as long as I live,

My Lord,

Your Grace's

moſt humble, *&c.*

A SECOND LETTER OF Dr. *DU MOULIN* TO THE DUKE of *BOUILLON*,

In Anſwer to a Letter of the Duke's to his Siſter *Mademoiſelle de Bouillon.*

MY LORD,

Mademoiſelle de Bouillon, your Siſter, hath done me the Honour to impart unto me Your Grace's Letters to her about the Cauſes that diſquiet your Conſcience. Upon which, I hope that your Goodneſs will not take it ill that I make ſome Reflections, and try whether God will make Uſe of me to contribute ſomething towards the Quiet of your Soul, and to turn you from

the way which I ſee you take, contrary to the Doctrine of the Goſpel.

You begin, by expreſſing your Deſign not to ſeparate your ſelf from my Lady Dutcheſs your Wife neither in this World nor in the other: Whereby you declare, that you had reſolved to be of your Ladies Religion, before you knew whether it was good or evil, and that your Enquiries about Matters of Religion were made after you had formed that Deſign, and taken that Reſolution. Concerning which I could ſay many things, but Reſpect ſtops me, being unwilling to be offenſive to Your Grace.

You ſay next, that you have not ſought the Grounds of the Religion of My Lady Dutcheſs any where but in the Holy Scripture. And yet in your whole Letter you allegde not any one Text of it.

You ſay next, that it is a point in controverſie which are the Holy Scriptures; in which Queſtion we have great Advantages: For the Books of *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Maccabees*, *&c.* are Books not extant in the *Hebrew*, which is the Original Tongue of the Scriptures of

of the *Old Teſtament*. Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles cite the Books of *Moſes*, the *Pſalms*, the *Prophets*, *&c.* but never cite any of thoſe *Apocryphal* Books. The Jewiſh Church before Chriſts coming never did acknowledge thoſe Books *. And thoſe Books are ſtuffed with Fables, as I have fully ſhewed in my Book againſt Cardinal *du Perron*. And whereas you appeal for the grounds of your Religion to the Fathers, we have for us the Councel of *Laodicea*, *Melito*, *Origen*, *Euſebius*, *Athanaſius*, *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Amphilochius*, *Epiphanius*, *Tertullian*, *Hierom*, *Ruffin*, *Hilary*, *Philaſtrius*, *Gregory* I. Biſhop of *Rome*, and many more, all which to alledge might be tedious to your Grace: Yet, if you ſhall command it, I will ſend you a full Liſt of them.

St. *Auſtin* in this Point doth contradict himſelf; and the Third Council of *Carthage*, which is objected to us, is otherwiſe in the *Greek* Copies than in the *Latin*.

* As we learn of *Joſephus* and *Philo*: *Book* 1. *chap.* 61.

Of the Interpretation of Scripture.

You add, that there is a Controverſie about the Interpretation of Scripture. The Pope and the *Roman* Church boaſt themſelves to be the infallible Interpreters, and Sovereign Judges of the Senſe of it. Yet the *Roman* Church never made any Interpretation of Scripture which was generally approved. We have onely Comments of Doctors, who diſagree among themſelves. Truly the Church of *Rome* intends not to make Scripture plainly underſtood, ſince ſhe hides it from the People, and will not have it to be read, and hath forbidden the Tranſlation of it into the vulgar Tongues. What Interpretation can we expect from the Pope, who boaſteth that he can change the Commandments of God, and ſaith that Scripture is ſubject unto him?

Be pleaſed my Lord, eſpecially to conſider, whether it be juſt and reaſonable that the Pope ſhould be Judge in his own Cauſe, and whether the *Roman* Church can be the Sovereign Judge of her own Duty; and whether in this Que-

Queſtion, whether the *Roman* Church be a Sovereign Judge in points of Faith, the *Roman* Church her Self can be the Judge.

To give you ſome Inſtances of this, Jeſus Chriſt ſaith to St. *Peter*, and to all his Apoſtles, *Whatſoever thou ſhalt bind on Earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven* &c. Upon which Text the *Roman* Prelate groundeth his Primacy. In Conſcience is it juſt, that he ſhould be acknowledged the Sovereign and infallible Judge and Interpreter of thoſe Texts upon which he groundeth his Empire? For who can doubt but that he will give Judgment on his own ſide; as indeed by his Interpretations he hath laid up for himſelf greater Riches than that of the greateſt Kings, and hath built to himſelf an earthly Empire. See then how he interprets that Text. Becauſe Chriſt hath ſaid, *Whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe on Earth*; the Pope pretends he may alſo looſe thoſe under the Earth, drawing Souls out of Purgatory. And whereas Jeſus Chriſt in that Text ſpeaks only of looſing Sinners, that are bound with Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures, the Pope from that Text aſ- *Mat.* 16. 18. 19.

ſumes unto himſelf the Power of looſing Subjects from the Obedience ſworn unto their Princes, of diſpenſing with Oaths, of freeing Children from the Obedience due to their Fathers, and of diſſolving Marriages lawfully contracted. And whereas Chriſt gave to all his Diſciples that looſing Power, the Pope hath reſerved unto himſelf many Caſes, in which none but himſelf can give Abſolution. Beſides, he ſo interpreteth that Text, as if all that is ſaid unto St. *Peter* was ſaid unto the Pope, of which yet the Scripture ſaith nothing, and giveth to St. *Peter* no Succeſſor in his Primacy or in his Apoſtleſhip.

Your ſelf, My Lord, may judge whether the Pope, who hath forbidden Marriage unto Biſhops, can be a good Interpreter of the words of the Apoſtle, *A Biſhop muſt be the Husband of one Wife, having his children ſubject in all gravity.* Whether the Pope having taken away the Cup of the Lords Supper from the Laity, can be a good Interpreter of theſe words of Chriſt, *Drink ye all of it.* Whether the Pope and the *Roman* Church, which by Ca-

1 Tim. 3. 2, 3.

nons

nons of Councels command the Adoration of Images, can be good Interpreters of the Second Commandement which forbids it. Whether the Pope, who makes Ordinances for publick Brothel-houſes at *Rome*, can be a good Interpreter of Gods Commandement, *Thou ſhalt not commit Adultery*. Whether the Pope, who forbids Fleſh and other Meats, can be a good Interpreter of the Apoſtles Precept, *Whatſoever is ſet before you, eat, asking no queſtion for Conſcience ſake*. Whether the *Roman* Church, which in the Councel of *Trent* defineth, that *Coveting* is no ſin, be a good Interpreter of the Commandement, *Thou ſhalt not covet*. Whether the Pope, who brings into the publick Service a Language not underſtood by the People, can be a good Interpreter of the fourteenth Chapter of the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, where it is ſo many times forbidden to pray and ſpeak in the Church in an unknown Tongue. Whether Pope *John* XXIII, who denied the Immortality of the Soul, and for that Crime and many more was condemned by the Councel of *Conſtance*, could have

been a good Interpreter of thoſe Texts of Scripture which ſpeak of Eternal Life.

For your part, My Lord, you take another courſe. For, without ſpeaking of the Authority of the *Roman* Church, which acknowledgeth no Judge but the Pope, you ſay that you have found in the Fathers of the five firſt Centuries, the Religion which you ſeem reſolved to embrace. Wherein you reſiſt openly the *Roman* Church, which admitteth not the Fathers for her Judges, and condemn them very often of Errour, Ignorance, and Hereſie.

Then you contradict the very Fathers, who in a thouſand places refuſe to be believed or received for Judges, and ſend the Reader continually to the Holy Scripture. Hardly ſhall you find many Texts of Scripture wherein the Fathers agree about the Interpretation. You may be pleaſed therefore to conſider, that you undertake a Journey in a way where you ſee no Light. They are *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers which you never read, and where you can get no Information for your Judge-

Judgment. A man that hath nothing elſe to do, needs to ſpend ten years in ſtudy before he can get ſome mediocrity of knowledge in them; and the words which they uſe are taken now in a quite different ſenſe. How can you know whether the Paſſages brought to you be faithfully alledged? How can you know whether the Books whence they are taken be not ſuppoſititious? Of which the Multitude is incredible. But after all, If the Verdict of the Fathers be received, the *Roman* Church muſt be caſt, and it will appear that their Religion is but New. Since the *Roman* Church and the Pope boaſt that they can alter the Commandements of God, and make new Articles of Faith, even in that they have a new Religion.

Now you may ask, Who then ſhall be the Interpreter? Who can give us the true Senſe of Scripture? I anſwer, that ſince the Queſtion here is of an Interpreter that cannot err, and who ſhall always infallibly find out the true Senſe? there is no ſuch in being. God hath not in any place of his Word beſtowed that Gift of

In-

Infallible Interpretation upon the *Roman* Church, no more than upon the *Greek* or the *Syrian*. There is no need of ſuch an Interpreter; for things neceſſary to Salvation are ſo clearly ſet down in Scripture, that they need no Interpretation. Muſt we have an Interpreter to know that God hath created the World, that we muſt love God with all our heart, that the Son of God is dead for us? Now, I ſay, that all the Points neceſſary to Salvation are to be found in Scripture, in terms as clear as theſe.

The Interpretations uſed by the Paſtors of our Churches, are taken from the Scripture it ſelf, ſo they are not the Interpreters; it is God that expounds himſelf. For Example; When they expound theſe words, *This is my Body*; they take the Interpretation from Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, who ſaith, that it is a *Commemoration of him*, and from three Evangeliſts, who ſay with one accord, that Jeſus Chriſt hath *given Bread* to his Diſciples; and from the words of Chriſt, that he drunk the *Fruit of the Vine*, we expound his other words, *this is my Bloud*. We ex-

expound alſo theſe words of Chriſt, *This is my Body*, from St. *Pauls* words, who (1 *Cor.* 11.) ſaith four times, that we eat Bread in the Lords Supper, and that we break Bread. Certainly, that Apoſtle giveth a clear Expoſition of Chriſt's words, *This is my Body, and this is my Blood*, ſaying, (1 Cor. 10. 16.) *The Cup of Bleſſing which we bleſs, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Chriſt? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Chriſt?*

We alledge alſo thoſe Texts that ſay, that Jeſus Chriſt is no more in this World; that the Heaven doth contain him; that Chriſt is like unto us in all things, ſin onely excepted; and that by conſequent he hath not a Body diſperſed in a Million of ſeveral places at once, and incloſed whole in every Crum of the Hoſt, and in every Drop of the Chalice.

Likewiſe, when Jeſus ſaith, *Do this in remembrance of me*; We expound not theſe words as the Councel of *Trent* doth, which puts this Senſe upon them, I do conſtitute you to be Prieſts, to ſacrifice my Body really under

under the *ſpecies* of Bread and Wine, but we bring the Interpretation which St. *Paul* addeth (1 *Cor.* 11. 26.) *For as often as you eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do ſhew the Lords Death.*

Conſider alſo, that there is great Difference between a Judgment of Authority, and a Judgment of Diſcretion. With this laſt we judge of Meats by the Taſte, without giving Laws to any. And it is ſo, that not only Paſtours but alſo every one of the People, may and doth judge of the true Doctrine. And it is ſo that St. *Paul* will have the Corinthians to judge of his Doctrine (1 *Cor.* 10. 15.) *I ſpeak as to wiſe men, judge ye what I ſay.*

Of that matter and of the Interpretation of Scripture, I have written a Book purpoſely, which I have dedicated to your Grace, and which was preſented to you by Monſieur *de Cabrilles* from me. I asked your Grace at *Liege*, whether you had received it. Your Anſwer was, that you knew not what was in it: for you have laboured to ſtrengthen your ſelf with Reaſons againſt us, but would not take Notice how we anſwer them; and have converſed much

much with our Adverſaries, but hid your ſelf from your Servants, who might have cleared your Mind about their Objections, and armed you with Anſwers.

Of the Condemnation of Hereticks.

Your Grace ſaith farther, that you have deſired to ſee whether the ancient Hereticks were condemned by Perſons of our Religion, and whether one man be found in all Antiquity that had the ſame Religion as we, in all Points. Theſe Condemnations of Hereticks were made by men found in the Faith, that were of the ſame Religion as we in all points, who have condemned many Errours now received in the *Roman* Church.

The Councel of *Laodicea* approved by many Univerſal Councels which were held ſince, rejecteth the Books of *Judith*, *Tobit*, *Maccabees*, and other Apochryphal Books.

The *Eliberin* Councel held about the year of the Lord 305 hath made this Canon, *It is decreed, that there ſhall be no Picture in the Church, that the things that*

are

are adored (or ſerved) be not painted upon Walls. The Councels that have commanded the Adoration of Images are later by 4 or 5 hundred years.

In the firſt *Nicen* Councel, the Marriage of the Paſtors of the Church was approved, upon the Remonſtrance of *Paphnutius.* Such is the fourth Canon of the Councel of *Gangra, If any makes a Difference of a married Prieſt, as if he ought not to participate of the Oblation when he doth adminiſter, let him be Anathema.*

This is the XXXV Canon of the Councel of *Laodicea, Chriſtians muſt not forſake the Church of God, and go to ſerve Angels, and gather Congregations. If any then be found applying himſelf to that ſecret Idolatry, let him be Anathema, becauſe he hath forſaken the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Son of God.*

About the year of the Lord 399, a Councel was held at *Carthage*, of which this is the 23 Canon; *When Service is made at the Altar, the Prayer muſt always be addreſs't to the Father.* The preſent *Roman* Church contradicts that Canon, for in their Service they have Prayers addreſt unto Saints.

This

This is the 25 Canon of the ſame Councel, *In the Divine Service, let nothing be offered, but the Body and Blood of the Lord, that is, Bread and Wine mingled with Water.*

The 16 Canon of the IV Councel of *Carthage*, abſolutely *forbids ſwearing by the Creatures.* To this the Catechiſm of the Councel of *Trent* is contrary, which approveth ſwearing by Relicks.

The 10 Canon of that Councel of *Carthage* ſaith, *Mulier baptizare non preſumat*, Let not a Woman preſume to baptize. The Practiſe of the *Roman* Church is contrary to that.

The *Milenitan* Councel where St. *Auſtin* was preſent, and of which he hath made the Canons, forbids Appeals from *Africk* to *Rome*, in theſe Words, *It is declared, That if the Prieſts or other Clerks in ſuch Cauſes, as they ſhall have, ſhall complain of the Judgment of their Biſhops, the Biſhops ſhall hear them: But he that will appeal beyond the Seas, let him not be admitted to the Communion by any living in* Africk.

In the VI Councel of *Carthage*, there is a long Epiſtle of the Councel, to *Cele-*

Celeſtin Biſhop of *Rome*, who, by a new Uſurpation, would draw to himſelf the Appeals of the Biſhops of *Africk*; whereby the Fathers of the Councel beſeech him to receive no more Appeals from their Countrey, forbidding him to ſend any more of his Legats, or to uſe any more forged Canons to raiſe his Dignity, and bring Worldly Pride into the Church of Chriſt. Therefore *Baronius*, and *Bellarmin*, and *Cotton*, Jeſuits, condemn that Councel.

In the Councel of *Chalcedon*, held in the Year of the Lord 451, the Legats of the Biſhop of *Rome* pretending to the Primacy, and bringing forth a forged Canon of *Nicea*, laboured to hinder the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* from being equal with the Biſhop of *Rome*, againſt which, the Councel made this Canon. *The Fathers, with good reaſon, have given Prerogatives to the See of Antient* Rome, *becauſe ſhe was the Imperial City. And the hundred and fifty Biſhops of the firſt Councel of* Conſtantinople, *moved with the like conſideration, have attributed to the moſt holy See of New* Rome, *which is* Conſtantinople, *equal*

Pri-

Priviledges ; judging with good reaſon, that the City honoured with the Empire and the Senate, and which hath the ſame Prerogatives as the Antient Rome *Imperial, ought to be magnified as much as* [Rome] *it ſelf in Eccleſiaſtical things.*

The Popes of our time and their Advocates condemn that Council, not only becauſe it equalleth the Biſhop of *Conſtantinople* with that of *Rome*, but chiefly becauſe it groundeth the preeminence of the Biſhop of *Rome* upon the Dignity of the City, becauſe *Rome* is the Capital City of the Empire, and not upon the Succeſſion in the Apoſtleſhip of St. *Peter*. For the Fathers of that Council do not acknowledge him in that Quality.

The Council of *Aurange* condemneth the Merits in the 12th Canon, ſaying, *God loveth us, according as we ſhall be by his Grace, and not ſuch as we ſhall be through our Merits.*

In the Year of our Lord 549, *Reparatus* Biſhop of *Carthage* called a Synod, in which *Vigilius* Biſhop of *Rome* was anathematized as an Heretick *Eutychian* : And *Honorius* Biſhop of *Rome* was condemned by the VI and

the VII Universal Councils, as an Heretick *Monothelite*. In the VI Council of *Constantinople*, assembled again in the Palace of *Trulle*, in the 17 and the 77 Canon, the Church of *Rome* is expresly, and by name condemned, and is commanded to hinder no more the cohabitation of Priests with their Wives, and to Fast no more on the Lords Day, upon pain of Deposition, or Excommunication. Whence it appeareth by the way, that the *Greek* and *Eastern* Church, in which that Council was celebrated, was not subject to the *Roman* Church, since she prescribed Laws to her.

In the Year 754, a Council composed of 338 Bishops, was held at *Constantinople*, in which it was decreed, that Images should be removed out of Churches, and the worship of them was forbidden. There also the Bread of the Eucharist is called the *Image*, and the *Figure* of the Body of Jesus Christ.

But in the Year 787 the Empress *Irene* assembled another Council against that Council at *Nicea*, in which Images were set up again, and the

the Worſhip of them was commanded upon Pain of *Anathema*. But in the year 794, the Emperour *Charles* the Great, cauſed that Council of *Nicea* to be condemned by another Council aſſembled at *Frankford*, although he knew, that Pope *Adrian* was of a contrary Opinion, and had defended that Council of *Nicea* by an expreſs Book.

This is, My Lord, the Condemnation of Errours about our Controverſies, which I find in the ancient Councils. Neither could I find any ancient Council, which (in matters of Faith) condemns the Doctrine that we profeſs. For the Chronicle of *Gaultier*, (which was ſhewed to your Grace,) repreſenteth things falſly, and doth not agree with other Authors of his Religion, who juſtifie us againſt moſt of his Calumnies.

I am ready to undergo any Puniſhment, if in the 500 years, which your Grace mentions, one only man be found, that had a Religion any whit like the preſent Religion of the *Roman* Church. In the ancient Church the publick Service was celebrated in the

vulgar Tongue underſtood by the People. The Laity received the Communion in the two kinds. The reading of Scripture was not prohibited to the People. The Church did not believe *Purgatory*. Before the year 370 of the Lord, no Tract is found of Invocation of Saints. There was no Mention of *Roman* Indulgences, nor of the Treaſure of the Church, in which the Pope hath laid up the Overplus of the penal Works, and Satisfactions of Saints and Monks, which he diſtributes among the People by his Indulgences. In thoſe days they made no Images of God. They worſhipped not the Images of Saints. They adored not the conſecrated Hoſt with Worſhip of *Latria*. They ſpake not of Accidents without a Subject. They believed not, that Mice could gnaw the Body of Chriſt, or that it could be blown away by the Wind, or ſtole or devoured by Beaſts, as we are taught in the Beginning of the Miſſal.

In thoſe days, the Biſhops of *Aſia*, *Africa*, *Ægypt*, *Græce*, &c. took no Oath of Allegiance to the *Roman* Biſhop in their Ordination, and took no

Letters

Letters of Inveſtiture from him. In thoſe Days they believed not that Jeſus Chriſt had eaten his own Body in the Communion. They believed not, that it was in the Prieſts Power to create his Creator. The Pope did not ſtyle himſelf God and the Divine Majeſty. He boaſted not, that he could not err, and that he was the Sovereign Judge of Controverſies. He drew no Souls out of *Purgatory*. He took not upon him the Power of adding to the Creed. He canonized no Saints. He gave no Pardons of two or three hundred years. He diſpenſed not with Vows and Oaths. He neither gave nor took away Kingdoms. He put no Kingdom in Interdict.

In thoſe days, the Bleſſed Virgin *Mary* was not called the Queen of Heaven, and the Lady of the World. The Biſhop of *Rome* did not beſtow ſeveral Offices upon Saints, charging one to look over ſuch a Country, another to ſuch a Diſeaſe, another to ſuch a Trade. They ſpake not in thoſe days of *Franciſcan* Fryars, nor of *Dominicans*, nor of *Capucins*, nor of *Jeſuits*, nor of *Beads*, *Roſaries*, *Agnus Dei*, and the

like Commodities. In a Word, the *Roman* Religion is a Religion ſpick and ſpan new, and an horrible defacing of the ancient Religion taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles.

If Your Grace hath ſuch a great Deſire to be inſtructed about Antiquity, you may deſire one of thoſe that take upon them to inſtruct you, to give you but one Example upon any of the forementioned Points. I am ſure that they will never undertake it, it being utterly impoſſible.

I could ſhew to Your Grace, that all theſe Inventions were deviſed to ſerve the Gain and Ambition of the Pope and his Clergy. But I will paſs to that which Your Grace addeth.

Of the Pope's Primacy.

From thence you paſs to the Pope's Primacy, and ſpeak thus; I ſought to be informed, whether all the Weſtern Churches had not always acknowledged the Biſhop of *Rome* to be the Primate and the Head of the viſible Church, eſtabliſhed by our Lord for the Conduct of the ſame; and ſeeing the

the Proteſtants were ſo far from rejecting the firſt five Centuries, that they often both in their Sermons and Books, quote and produce the Fathers that writ in thoſe Ages. I thought the ſhorteſt way for my Information would be to ſee what were the Sentiments of thoſe Fathers in the controverted Points.

Truly my Lord, that ſhort way which you ſay you have taken, is of an infinite Length, and indeed there is no end of it. It would have been a far ſhorter way to have asked of the ableſt men of the *Roman* Church, whether it may be found in Gods Word, that God hath eſtabliſhed the Pope Succeſſor of St. *Peter* in his Apoſtleſhip, and in his Primacy over the Univerſal Church. They would have freely confeſt unto you, that the Holy Scripture ſaith nothing of it, and that it is a Tradition about which we have no Commandment of God.

I obſerve alſo, that you ſpeak only of the Weſtern Churches, whence I gather, that he who ſuggeſted theſe things to your Grace, knows that the *Eaſtern* and the *African* Church never

acknowledged the Biſhop of *Rome* in that Quality and Character. Now thoſe Churches were then greater than the Weſtern, as alſo they are ancienter. Now by the Councils approved both by the Weſtern and the Eaſtern Churches, which I have already alledged to your Grace, the Pride of the Biſhop of *Rome*, who began then to lift up himſelf is cenſured.

And though you had proved that the Weſtern have always acknowledged the Pope as Head of the Church, it availeth nothing, unleſs it be proved alſo, that his Primacy then conſiſted in doing thoſe things which he doth now. Did he then boaſt that he could not err? Did he vaunt himſelf as Sovereign Judge of the Senſe and Interpretation of Scripture? Did he give Indulgences? Did he draw Souls out of *Purgatory*? Did he give and take away Kingdoms? Did he call himſelf God? Did he boaſt that he hath Power to add unto the Creed? For in vain do we diſpute about Titles, when the things are different.

I would

I would alſo beſeech your Grace to ſee whether you be not abuſed; for indeed many Paſſages in the Fathers are found, which ſay that the Biſhop of *Rome* is Succeſſor to St. *Peter*: But they ſpeak of the Succeſſion in the Charge of Biſhop of the City of *Rome*, not in the Apoſtleſhip, or in the Primacy over the Univerſal Church. And it is very remarkable, that all the Examples of the Popes Authority brought out of Antiquity, are within the Limits of the *Roman* Empire. And that it cannot be found for above a thouſand years after our Saviours time, that the Biſhops of *Rome* did intermeddle with the Affairs of Churches without the *Roman* Empire, as of the *Perſian*, *Armenian*, and *Indian* Churches. In all that time he never gave them any Laws, he never received any Appeal from them.

And that you may ſee what was the Face of the ancient Church in that Point, I will lay down before your Grace ſome Examples according to the Order of the Ages.

For the firſt Age we find that St. *Peter* writ his laſt Epiſtle being near his

his Death, as he ſaith himſelf in the firſt Chapter; and then, or never it was time for him to ſay, now my Death is at Hand, but I leave you for my Succeſſor the Biſhop of *Rome*, to whom I will have the Univerſal Church be ſubject; but of that he ſaith nothing, nor takes any of thoſe Titles upon him which the Pope now attributes unto himſelf. St. *Peter* being dead, if there had been any Queſtion about chooſing a Head for the Univerſal Church in his Room, no Doubt but that ſome Apoſtle as St. *James* or St. *John* muſt have ſucceeded him; for St. *John* outlived St. *Peter* about thirty years, but no ſuch thing was done. In the ſame Age lived *Dionyſius Areopagite*, to whom are aſcribed by them of the *Roman* Church, the Books of Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy. Reaſon required that he ſhould ſpeak of the Sovereign Hierarch, who now is called the Pope. Yet he ſpeaks never a word of him, he deſcribeth all the Eccleſiaſtical Offices and Degrees, making no Mention of the Head of the Church, for he did not acknowledge any.

We

We find by the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, that in that Age and long after, the Biſhop of *Rome*, was elected by the Suffrages of the Clegy of that Dioceſan Church, with the Conſent of their People; An evident Proof that they believed not in thoſe days, that the Biſhop of *Rome* was Head of the Univerſal Church. For had he been ſo, the Univerſal Church muſt have contributed to his Election; the People of *Rome* having no right to give a Head to the Church of all the World.

That Age did ſwarm with Hereſies, which the Biſhop of *Rome* did not condemn, nor had any Cogniſance of them. None that we read of were condemned by any Council for not obeying the Biſhop of *Rome*, and refuſing to be judged by him. Our Adverſaries themſelves do not alledge any thing from the *Roman* Church of that Age, but only ſome falſe decretal Epiſtles of the Popes, which *Baronius* and *Bellarmine*, and *Binnius* and many others, acknowledge to be forged.

In

In the ſecond Century our Adverſaries find nothing for the Popes Primacy. Only towards the end of that Age, upon the Queſtion about the Day of the Celebration of *Eaſter*, *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome*, ſeparated himſelf from the Communion of diverſe of the Oriental Churches, becauſe they preciſely obſerved the 14*th* day of the Moon of *March* for the day of *Eaſter*. For which Action, *Victor* was ſharply taken up by other Biſhops, and particularly by *Irenæus*, as *Euſebius* witneſſeth in the V Book, and 25 Chapter of his Hiſtory.

The third Age affords us many Examples to the contrary. In the year of our Lord 217 *Agrippinus* Biſhop of *Carthage* aſſembled a Council in *Africa*, in which it was reſolved and defined, that the Baptiſm of Hereticks was no Baptiſm. This was againſt the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, and whether of the two was in the Right it is not material; It is enough that thereby it appeareth, that the Church of *Africa* was not then ſubject to that of *Rome*.

In the year of our Lord 256 *Cyprian* Succeſſor of *Agrippinus* began to defend his Predeceſſors Doctrine. There being then a Diſcord between *Cornelius* Biſhop of *Rome* and one *Novatianus*, whereby the Church of *Rome* was in Trouble, *Cyprian* ſent two Legats to *Rome*, to compoſe the Difference, thereby taking as much Authority over the Church of *Rome*, as the Church of *Rome* uſe to exerciſe in the like Caſes. In all his Epiſtles to *Cornelius*, he giveth him no other Title but that of *Brother*, and acknowledgeth him not for his Superiour.

The Contention about rebaptizing of Hereticks grew hot between him, and *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome*, even to down-right ill Words. In the Epiſtle to *Pompeius*, which is the 74, *Cyprian* calls *Stephen* the Champion of Hereticks, proud, ignorant, imprudent, an Enemy to Chriſtians, preferring Falſhood before Truth, and Anti-Chriſt before Chriſt.

Moreover, he aſſembled a Council of 87 *African* Biſhops, who condemned *Stephen* Biſhop of *Rome* and his Doctrine, and that in Terms worſe than

Cyprian

Cyprian had given him. About the ſame time St. *Firmilianus* Biſhop of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, a man of great Authority alſo, bitterly reviled *Stephen*. From theſe things it ſufficiently appears, that theſe Biſhops were far from thinking themſelves ſubject to the Biſhop of *Rome*.

In that Age our Adverſaries find nothing for the Pope's Primacy; no Appeals to him from Churches, either far or neat; no Laws given to the Univerſal Church; onely ſome forged Decretal Epiſtles of the Biſhops of *Rome*, of thoſe times are produced, whoſe falſhood is acknowledged by the moſt Learned of the *Roman* Writers. In thoſe Epiſtles the Pope is made to ſpeak as a Maſter, having power over all the Emperours and Biſhops of the World; Whereas the Biſhops of *Rome* then confined the exerciſe of their Power to their own Dioceſs; not preſuming to give Laws to any other Churches, much leſs to their Temporal Governours.

Of thoſe three firſt Ages, Pope *Pius* the Second in his Epiſtle to *Martin Mayer*, which is the 188. ſpeaks thus,

Every

Every one then lived for himſelf, and little Reverence was deferred to the Roman *Church.*

In the year of our Lord 312. the Emperour *Conſtantine* being converted to the Chriſtian Religion, appointed Judges in the *Donatiſts* Caſe, *Melchiades* Biſhop of *Rome* being one of them. But the *Donatiſts* having complained of his Judgment, the Emperour commanded that their Cauſe ſhould be judged again by the Synod of *Arles*, who had power to confirm or diſannul the Judgment of *Melchiades*, and his Fellow-Judges.

Under that Emperour, the Chriſtian Church being delivered from Perſecutions, a new Order and Conſtitution was made over all the *Roman* Empire, to which *Sylveſter* Biſhop of *Rome* was not called. His Legend ſaith untruly, that he baptized *Conſtantine*, and healed him of a Leproſie; but upon that groundleſs Fable was built *the Donation of Conſtantine*, by which the Emperour is pretended to have given unto the Pope one half of his Empire.

The

The ſame Emperour, in the year 325. aſſembled a General Council out of the whole Empire, in which *Sylveſter* did not preſide, but *Hozius* Biſhop of *Corduba* in *Spain*, of whom our Adverſaries falſly ſay, that he preſided in that Council as the Pope's Legate: A thing repugnant to the Teſtimony of *Euſebius*, *Theodoret*, and *Sozomen*, and to the Acts of the *Nicene* Council, in which *Hozius* ſigned the firſt without ſtyling himſelf the Pope's Legat; and after him *Vitus* and *Vincentius* Deputies of the Biſhop of *Rome*.

To the Emperour *Conſtantine* ſucceeded his Son *Conſtantius*, who favouring the *Arrians*, baniſhed *Liberius* Biſhop of *Rome*, and gave him five hundred Crowns to maintain him in his Exile. But *Liberius*, to be reſtored to his Biſhoprick, joyned with the *Arrians*, and ſubſcribed their Confeſſion, in their Aſſembly at *Sirmium*.

In the year 381. the Emperour *Theodoſius* called a General Council at *Conſtantinople*, to which *Damaſus* Biſhop of *Rome* came not, nor ſent any Legate to it; that Council being aſ-

ſembled

ſembled without his conſent. In that Councii Hereſies were condemned, and the Order of the Patriarchs was altered, without asking the Advice of *Damaſus*. Yet that Council is one of the firſt four Oecumenical Councils.

About the ſame time, *Ambroſe* Biſhop of *Milan* refuſed to adminiſter the Communion to the Emperour *Theodoſius*, for a Murther committed by his Guards at *Theſſalonica*. *Ambroſe* did this without taking the Advice of *Damaſus* Biſhop of *Rome*, his Neighbour. Such an action in our dayes would be High Treaſon againſt the Pope. For it is one of the Fundamental Laws of the *Roman* Church, that Kings cannot be bound by Cenſures, or excommunicated but by the Pope's Order.

That I may not gather here a greater number of Examples, I have alledged before many Councils that have condemned Popes of Hereſie, and have forbidden them to ſend Legates, and receive Appeals from Foreign Churches.

The first Bishop of *Rome* (that I read of) who took upon him to govern the Church as Successor of St. *Peter*, was *Leo* the First, about the year of our Lord 450. For before him the Preeminence which was claimed by the *Roman* Bishops, was grounded only upon some mistaken or falsified Canons of Councils; and those in Consideration of the dignity of the City, which was the chief City of the Empire: For out of the *Roman* Empire the Bishops of *Rome* claimed no Superiority.

Some Passages are found, true or false, in which the Bishops of *Rome* are styled the first Bishops of the whole World, and Presidents over the Universal Church: But the Reason of it was, that the Ancients called the *Roman* Emperours, Governours and Masters of the World, and it is frequent in their Writings to call the Empire *Orbis Romanus*, the *Roman* World. The Truth of this is evident, because the same Titles are many times given to the other Patriarchs, or chief Bishops of the *Roman* Empire, *viz.* To the Bishop of *Constantinople*, to him of

of *Antioch*, and to him of *Alexandria*, who are alſo called the Heads and Sovereigns of all; and are ſaid to have the Care of all the Churches. Thus *Gregory Nazianzen* in his Oration upon *Athanaſius* ſaith, *That the Charge of the People of* Alexandria *was committed unto him, which is as much as if one ſaid the Government of all the World.* And in the ſame place he ſaith, that *Athanaſius gave Laws unto all the World.*

Baſil ſaith, that *Meletius* Biſhop of *Antioch, did preſide over the whole Body of the Church.* *Theodoret* in his Book of Hereſies, in the Chapter where he ſpeaks of *Neſtorius* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, calls him alſo the Biſhop τῆς οἰκουμένης *of the whole habitable World.* Wherefore alſo the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople* is called the Oecumenical or Univerſal Biſhop in the Councils of that Age. *Baſil. Epiſt.* 50.

For this Rule was conſtituted among the Patriarchs of the *Roman* Empire, that each of them was to take Care of all the Churches of the whole *Roman* Empire: but that Power was never extended beyond the Limits of the *Roman* Empire. Yea, ſome Paſſa-

ges are found in which that general Dignity is attributed unto all Biſhops that were eminent in Holineſs; as *Baſil* ſaith to *Ambroſe*, that *God had raiſed him to the Dignity of the Apoſtles.* And *Sidonius* calls *Lupus* Biſhop of *Troyes*, the *Biſhop of Biſhops, and the firſt Prelate of all the World.* In thoſe times all Biſhops were called Popes.

Idem ep. 55.

Sidon. lib. 6. ep. 1.

For the Popes Primacy Your Grace alledgeth St. *Hierom*, who writing to *Damaſus*, and acknowledging no other Preeminence than that of Jeſus Chriſt, ſaid, *I am in Communion with thy Beatitude*, that is, *with St.* Peter's *Chair.*

I ſee nothing there that favoureth the Popes Primacy over the Univerſal Church. For (as I mentioned before) the Biſhops of *Rome* were held St. *Peter*'s Succeſſors in his Government over the *Roman* Church; which Government they held to have been founded by St. *Peter*, and I would not diſpute about that. But they were not held Succeſſors of St. *Peter*'s Apoſtleſhip, nor of his Primacy. Saying to a man, I am of thy Communion, is not acknowledging him Head of the

the Univerſal Church. So much may be ſaid to any Biſhop that is ſound in the Faith; yea, to any true Believer we may ſay, that we muſt be of his Communion, and that he that gathereth not with him, is a Scatterer. There were then held to be three Chairs of St. *Peter*, one at *Rome*, another in *Alexandria*, another in *Antioch*. The Biſhops of theſe Cities ſtyled themſelves Succeſſors of St. *Peter* in the Government of thoſe Churches, not in the Apoſtleſhip. And there were always Piques and Quarrels between thoſe three Sees. *Gregory* the Firſt, Biſhop of *Rome*, in the 37 Epiſtle of his VI Book, ſaith that thoſe three Chairs are but one See, upon which three Biſhops are ſitting, and he acknowledgeth them his Equals, and that it belongs not to him to command them.

But they that ſhewed to Your Grace that Authority of St. *Hierom*, had more Wit than to ſhew you other Paſſages of his, in which he debaſeth very much the Biſhop of *Rome*, and giveth no good Character of the *Roman* Church of his Age. In his Epi-

ſtle to *Euagrius* he ſaith; *In what part ſoever a man is a Biſhop, whether it be at* Rome, *or at* Agobio, *whether at* Conſtantinople *or* Regio, *they have the ſame Dignity and Authority; Power and Wealth, or Meanneſs and Poverty, do not make one greater or lower than another. By their Place they are all Succeſſors of the Apoſtles.* And becauſe ſome alledged the Example of the *Roman* Church for preferring the Deacon before the Prieſt, he anſwereth, *Why doeſt thou alledge to me the Cuſtom of one City?* ſhewing that that was not to be a Rule to the Univerſal Church.

His Cuſtom is to call *Rome Babylon*, and the *Harlot*, and to exhort devout Perſons to come out of her. And in his Preface upon the Book of *Didymus* of the Holy Ghoſt, he ſpeaks thus, *When I was in* Babylon, *and was an Inhabitant of the* Harlot *clad in Purple, and lived after the Laws of the* Roman *Citizens, I would prate ſomewhat about the Holy Ghoſt, and dedicate my Work to the Biſhop of the City. But behold that Pot which is ſeen in* Jeremiah *after the Staff on the North-ſide, begins to boyl, and the Senate of the Phariſees begins*

gins to cry out, meaning by the Senate of the Phariſees, the Eccleſiaſtical *Roman* Senate.

And in the Epiſtle to *Marcella* under the name of *Paula* and *Euſtochium*, exhorting *Marcella* to come out of *Rome*, and to retire to *Bethlehem*, *I eſteem* (ſaith he) *that this place of* Bethlehem *is holier than the* Tarpeian *Rock*, (meaning the *Roman* Capitol) *which having ſo often been ſtruck with Lightning from Heaven, ſheweth that it is diſpleaſing unto God. Read St.* Johns *Revelation, and ſee what is foretold of the* Hatlot *clad with Purple, and of the Blaſphemy written on her forehead, and of the ſeven Mountains, and of the many Waters; fly from her my People, and be not Partaker of her Sins, leaſt you receive of her Plagues: It is fallen, it is fallen*, &c. But being gone from *Rome* into *Syria*, and living there in perpetual Quarrels with the Clergy of that Country, he was conſtrained to have Recourſe unto his old Maſter *Damaſus* (for he had been his Secretary) and to write to him thoſe kind Letters which you alledge.

After *Hierom* you bring St. *Auſtin* in theſe words, *Shall we doubt whether we muſt reſt in the Churches Lap, which by Succeſſion hath always had Sovereign Authority in the Apoſtolick Chair?* That Paſſage is found in the Book *de utilitate credendi*, in the 17 Chapter, but otherwiſe ſet down than Your Grace alledgeth. Diſputing againſt the *Manicheans*, with whom Scripture had no Authority, he uſeth humane and probable Proofs to exhort men to embrace the Chriſtian Religion. He ſaith then, *We ſeeing ſuch a great Aſſiſtance of God, and ſo great Proficiency & Improvement advance, ſhall we doubt to enter into the Lap of that Church,* [not the *Roman*, but *Catholick* Church] *which (even to the Confeſſion of Mankind) from the Apoſtolick See, by the Succeſſions of Biſhops, while the Hereticks in vain barked about her,* &c. *hath arrived at the height of Authority* [that is, to be the eſtabliſht Religion.]

In this Paſſage St. *Auſtin* neither mentioneth nor appears to have thought of the *Roman* Church. And although the Chair of *Rome* had been named in it, yet this would avail nothing

thing for the Primacy of the Biſhop of *Rome* over the Univerſal Church. For the Primacy of the Apoſtolick Chairs is attributed by the Ancients no leſs to the Church of *Alexandria*, of *Antioch*, of *Jeruſalem*, *&c.* than to the Church of *Rome*. *Sozomen* ſpeaks thus of the Council of *Nice*, *There met among the Biſhops that held Apoſtolick Sees*, Macarius *Biſhop of* Jeruſalem, Euſtathius *Biſhop of* Antioch *upon the River* Orontes, *and* Alexander *near the* Mareotid Marſhes. And again, of the *Epheſine* Council, *Cyrillus Prelate of the Apoſtolick See*, meaning *Jeruſalem*. *Ruffinus* in the ſecond Book, chap. 21. In *Alexandria Timothy*, in *Jeruſalem John, reſtored the Apoſtolick Sees*. *Theodoret* in the fifth Book of his Hiſtory chap. 9. calls *Antioch the moſt ancient Church and wholly Apoſtolick*. St. *Auſtin* in his 162 Epiſtle, ſpeaks of the Apoſtolick Sees in the plural, ſaying, that *Cecilian might have reſerved his Cauſe to the Judgment of the Apoſtolick Sees*. We have alledged *Baſil* before, ſaying that St. *Ambroſe* Biſhop of *Milan* had the Apoſtolick Preheminence, and *Hierom* ſaying, that all Biſhops are Succeſ-

Soz. hiſt. lib. 1. *c.* 16.

idem 4. 24.

Succeſſors of the Apoſtles. *Sidonius* in the firſt Epiſtle of the 6. Book, ſaith that *Lupus* Biſhop of *Troyes* had already ſet nine times five years in the Apoſtolick See.

They do then abuſe your Grace, that make you believe that *Auſtin* ſpeaks only of the Apoſtolick See of the *Roman* Biſhop, ſeeing that the Primacy of the Apoſtolick See, belonged to ſo many other Biſhops. And though in that place St. *Auſtin* had ſpoken of the Biſhop of *Rome* only, he had not thereby excluded the other Biſhops from the ſame Dignity. He that ſaith the King of *France* enjoyeth the Royal Preeminence, doth not thereby deny to the Kings of *England* and *Spain* their Authority in their own Countries.

Here it is obſervable, that St. *Auſtin* was never ſubject to the Biſhop of *Rome*, that he never took an Oath of Fidelity to him, that when he was admitted Biſhop, he took no Letters of Inveſtiture from him, and paid him no Annates for his Entry. He was one of thoſe that made the Canons of the *Milevitan* Council, which forbad

bad the Appeals from *Africa* to *Rome*; and one of thoſe that made that Remonſtrance to *Celeſtin* Biſhop of *Rome*, that he ſhould for the time to come abſtain from ſending Legats into *Africa*, and medling with their Buſineſſes, and uſing Suppoſititious Canons to advance his Authority. The Biſhops of *Africa* were of the ſame Faith with the Biſhop of *Rome*, and ſpake to him in reſpectful Terms, becauſe of the Dignity of the Imperial City, and becauſe they believed that St. *Peter* died at *Rome*, and had founded that Chair among many others. But if the Biſhops of *Rome* had taken upon them the Title of God, and boaſted that they could not err; if they had taken upon them to canonize Saints, to give Indulgences, to draw Souls out of Purgatory, to alter the Commandments of God, and to add unto the Creed; thoſe *African* Biſhops would have beſtowed their Cenſures upon him as freely as they did upon any other who fell into Hereſie.

Of

Of the Sacrifice of the Maſs.

For the Sacrifice of the Maſs, Your Grace alledgeth two Paſſages out of St. *Auſtin.* The one ſaith, *That the Catholick Faith ſuffers not that the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Lord be offered for thoſe that are not baptized.* In the other, ſpeaking of his dead Mother, he ſaith, that the *Sacrifice of our Ranſom was offered for her, when her Body was upon the Brink of the Grave.*

There is nothing more eaſie than to deceive one that will be deceived, and hath no Knowledge in the Fathers. St. *Auſtin* declareth his Mind upon this point very often, and tells us that the Euchariſt is called the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Jeſus Chriſt, becauſe it is the Sign and Figure of his Body and Blood; and that the Signs are ordinarily called by the Names of the things which they repreſent. Thus in his Epiſt. 23 to *Boniface*, *Hath not Chriſt been once ſacrificed in himſelf? And yet he is ſacrificed unto the People in a ſacred Sign; and he*

he doth not lye, who being asked, anſwereth, that he is ſacrificed. For if the Sacraments had not ſome Likeneſs to the things of which they are Sacraments, they could not be Sacraments. Now by Reaſon of that Likeneſs they take often the name of the very things.

Add to this the Canon, *i. e.* the *Roman* Code of Canon Law. *The Immolation of the Fleſh, which is done by the hands of the Prieſt is called the Paſſion, the Death, and the crucifying of Jeſus Chriſt, not in Truth, but by a ſignificant Myſtery.* *De conſecr. diſt. 2. cap. 48.*

This is then the Senſe of theſe places of St. *Auſtin*, that the Euchariſt is the Sacrifice of the ſame Price, becauſe it is the Sign and the Sacrament of it, and becauſe the Signs take commonly the name of the thing ſignified; as the ſame Father ſaith, *The ſignifying thing uſeth to take the name of the thing ſignified. And the Lord hath made no Difficulty to ſay, This is my Body, when he gave the Sign of his Body.* And *Theodoret* expounding theſe words, *This is my Body*, ſaith, that the *Lord hath given to the Sign the name of his Body.* St. Aug. *quæſt. 55. in Levit. Idem contra Adimant. c. 12. Theod. dialog. 1.*

And

Tertul. *contr.* Marc. 4. 40.

And *Tertullian*, *This is my Body*, that is, *the Sign of my Body*. Indeed the Euchariſt is called a *Sacrifice of our Ranſom*, in the ſame manner, as in the Inſtitution of the Sacrament, the Bread is called the Body of Chriſt; and in the ſame manner as the Cup is called the New Teſtament, becauſe it is the Sacrament and Memorial of the ſame; for neither the Cup nor that which is in it is a Teſtament. St. *Auſtin* knew that Jeſus Chriſt hath wholly paid our Ranſom on the Croſs, and that there is no other Ranſom but the Death of Jeſus Chriſt to redeem us: now the Euchariſt is not the Death of Jeſus Chriſt. And if to apply the Sacrifice of the Croſs unto us, we muſt ſacrifice Jeſus Chriſt again; by the ſame Reaſon to apply the Death of Jeſus Chriſt unto us, we muſt put him to Death again.

But what can we ask more, ſince our Adverſaries confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt did not offer himſelf in Sacrifice in the Euchariſt, and put that Sacrifice among the unwritten Traditions? So much *Bellarmine* confeſſeth in the firſt Book of the Maſs, *Chap.* 27.

§ *Quin-*

§ *Quinta. The Oblation* (ſaith he) *which is made after the Conſecration belongeth to the Integrity of the Sacrifice, but not to the Eſſence of it; which is proved, becauſe the Lord did not make that Oblation nor the Sacrifice at the firſt.* And both *Baronius* and the Jeſuit *Salmeron* put the Maſs and the Sacrifice of the ſame among the unwritten Traditions.

As for the Paſſage you alledge out of the Catechiſms of *Cyrill* of *Jeruſalem*, I need ſay no more but that the Book which you quote is ſuppoſititious, whoſe Style is far different from that of the other beforegoing. God hath permitted that an evident Sign of Forgery ſhould be in that Book; the Author exhorteth his Hearers, that they be no more Spectators of the Combats of Gladiators of the Amphitheater, and of the Horſe-races in the Hippodrome: But ſince *Jeruſalem* was Chriſtian, there hath been no Spectacles in the Amphitheater or Hippodrome. *Geſner* in his *Bibliotheca* ſaith, that he hath ſeen thoſe *Catechiſms* in the Library of *Ausburg*, under the name of *John* of *Conſtantinople.*

Of

Of the Invocation of Saints.

For the Invocation of Saints, Your Grace alledgeth St. *Ambroſe* in the Book of Widows, where he ſaith, *That we muſt pray to the Angels that have the keeping of us, and to the Saints and Martyrs, of whom we may expect Aſſiſtance.* St. *Ambroſe* writ that Book when he was a new Chriſtian, but he changed his Language after that time: for in his Oration for *Theodoſius*, written long after, he ſaith, *Thou alone, O Lord, muſt be called upon and prayed to. And* Mary *was the Temple of God, but ſhe was not God; wherefore we muſt worſhip God alone who wrought in that Temple.* And a little before, *We read, that we muſt not worſhip any but God, for it is written, Thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.*

St. Ambr. *l.* 3. *c.* 12. *de Sp. Sanct.*

The Comment upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans* aſcribed to *Ambroſe*, upon the firſt Chapter ſaith, *Addreſs is made to the King by Colonels and Governours, becauſe the King is a man and knoweth not to whom he ought to commit the*

the Adminiſtration of the State; but to get Gods Favour who is ignorant of nothing, (for he knoweth what men are deſerving) there is no need of any ones Suffrage to help us, but of a devout Spirit. And upon *Coloſ.* 1. *Chriſt holds the Primacy in all things; wherefore if any beleive that he muſt have Devotion for ſome Element, or for ſome of the Angels and Powers, let him know that he is in an Errour.*

Chryſoſtom in his firſt Sermon of Penitence, ſpeaks thus, *God muſt be prayed to without an Interceſſor.* And upon *Heb.* 1. in his third Homily, *Why do you look up to Angels, gaping after them? They are Servants to the Son of God, ſent to ſeveral places in your behalf.* And in the eighteenth Homily upon the Epiſtle to the *Romans*, towards the end, *To whom wilt thou have Recourſe? Whoſe Help wilt thou implore? Wilt thou call upon* Abraham? *But he cannot hear thee. Wilt thou call upon thoſe Virgins? But they will give thee none of their Oyl. Wilt thou call upon thy Father or thy Grand-father? but none of them, though never ſo holy, hath Power to alter that Judgment. Theſe things being conſider-*

ed, thou muſt venerate him, and pray to him alone, who hath Power to blot out that Obligation, and to put out that Flame.

S. Aug. *Enchir. c.* 3. St. *Auſtin* ſaith, *Of God alone we muſt ask the Good which we hope to do, or hope to obtain by our good Works.* And in the Book of the Quantity of the Soul, 34 *chap. God alone muſt be ſerved by the Soul, for he alone is the Maker of it.* And in the laſt Chapter of the Book of the true Religion. *Let the Worſhip of dead men be none of our Religion; for if they have lived godly, they are not ſo diſpoſed to ſeek ſuch Honours: but they would have us worſhip him, by whoſe Illumination they rejoyce that we are Partners of their Dignity. We muſt therefore honour them by way of Imitation, and not worſhip them on the account of Religion.* And he ſpeaks thus to God, *Whom can I find to reconcile me with thee? Muſt I addreſs my ſelf to Angels? By what Prayers? By what Sacraments? Many have tryed theſe ways, and are fallen to the Deſire of curious Viſions, and have deſerved to be deceived.*

Idem l. confeſs. c. 42.

Tertullian in the thirtieth Chapter of his *Apologetick*, ſpeaks thus, *I cannot*

not ask theſe things of any but him of whom I know that I ſhall obtain them. For it is he only that grants them, and I am he that have a Right to obtain them, being his Servant that call upon him alone.

Likewiſe *Origen* againſt *Celſus*, the eighth Book ſaith, *Above all things, we muſt pray to none but God and his only Son.* *Ignatius* who lived near the time of the Apoſtles, ſaith in the Epiſtle to the *Philadelphians*, *You Virgins have none but Jeſus Chriſt, and the Father of Jeſus Chriſt in your Prayers.* *Clemens Alexandrinus* ſpeaks thus, *There being none but one only that is truly good, which is* God, *both we and the Angels pray to him alone.* And ſo *Athanaſius.* *It is manifeſt* (ſaith he) *that the Patriarch* Jacob *in his Prayer joyned none with God, but him that is his Word; becauſe it is he only, that manifeſteth the Father unto us.*

Cl. Alexand. l. 7. Strom.

Athan. Orat. 4. cont. Arian.

By a notorious Falſhood, among the Works of this Father, was foiſted a Book of the Mother of God, where ſhe is called the Queen of Heaven, and Chriſtians are commanded to adore her. But *Bellarmine* in his Book

of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, and *Baronius* in the year 48. § 19 & 20. acknowledges the Book to be ſuppoſititious. By the like Forgery in St. *Auſtin*'s Book of the Spirit and the Soul, there is a Prayer to the Saints inſerted, but in the ſame Book *Boetius* is quoted, who was not born when *Auguſtine* dyed, an evident Proof that the book is falſely attributed to him.

There is a Book of the ſame Father, *Of the Care that muſt be had of the Dead*, which is truly his, but corrupted and falſified in many places: For he is made to ſpeak of Prayers to Saints departed as good and laudable; yet he ſaith there, that the departed Saints know nothing of all that the Living do; and that if it were otherwiſe, his good and holy Mother would not have forſaken him. Then he addeth, *The Spirits of the deceaſed are in a place where they ſee nothing of all that is done, or that happeneth to men in this Life.* And a little after. *It muſt be acknowledged that the dead know not that which is done here, while it is a doing, but they know it afterwards by them that dye and come to them.* Was St. *Auſtin* ſo much overſeen

as

as to teach that thoſe muſt be called upon by us who underſtand us not, nor know what is done here below, unleſs ſome dye, and perhaps afterwards bring them News of it?

This Advantage we have in this point, that our Adverſaries acknowledge, that there is no Commandment of God for the Invocation of Saints, and that the Holy Scripture ſaith nothing of it: And that under the Old Teſtament, that is, for the ſpace of four thouſand years, the Church uſed no Invocation of them. All the Prayers in Scripture are addreſſed unto God alone, and therefore we have no Aſſurance or Encouragement to call upon the Saints, which we can ground upon the Word of God. Is it not enough for us to have the Son of God for our Interceſſor, who tells us, *None comes to the Father but by me*, *John* 14. For how can we pray with Faith and Aſſurance to thoſe who diſcern not the Prayers of the Heart? For Scripture tells us that *God alone knoweth the Hearts of men.* 2 *Chron.* 6. 30.

I might ſay, that in the *Roman* Church many Saints are prayed to that never were in the World, and others whoſe Holineſs is very dubious, and whoſe Lives were very bad. Three hundred and ſeventy years paſt in the Chriſtian Church without any Invocation of Saints. The firſt that uſed it was *Gregory Nazianzen*, who yet invocating the Souls of *Conſtantius*, (who was an *Arian*) of *Athanaſius*, and of *Baſil*, added this Clauſe, *If thou underſtand me*, and *If the Dead have any Senſe*: But the Invocation of Saints was not received till a long time after in the Publick Service.

All theſe things conſidered, My Lord, I cannot wonder enough that Your Grace chooſeth rather to be ruled by one Paſſage of St. *Ambroſe*, which perhaps is forged, than by the Word of God, and the Church of the firſt Ages after Chriſt. For would you ſubſcribe to all that St. *Ambroſe* ſaith? In the firſt book of Virgins he ſaith, that *the Angels fell by lying with Women*. In his Speech upon *Gratian* and *Valentinian*, and upon the firſt Pſalm, he ſaith, that *ſome riſe again*

ſooner

ſooner than others. And in his Oration of the Faith of Reſurrection, he makes three ſorts of Reſurrection; the firſt of the Patriarchs and Apoſtles, the ſecond of the Gentiles converted to the Faith, the third of thoſe that come from the South and the North. In his firſt Book of Offices *chap.* 50. he condemneth ſecond Marriages. In the firſt Book of the Holy Ghoſt, he teacheth that the Baptiſm in the name of the Holy Ghoſt alone, without naming the Father and the Son, is valid. In the tenth Sermon upon the 118 *Pſalm*, he ſaith that the Damned which are in Hell, ſhall in the end be ſaved, when the time of their Puniſhment is fulfilled.

The *Roman* Church believeth not with *Ambroſe*, that all Saints ſhall be burnt with the material Fire of the day of Judgment, as we ſhall ſee hereafter. Neither doth the *Roman* Church believe with *Ambroſe*, that *Melchiſedeck* was Jeſus Chriſt himſelf. Many Pages might be filled with the like Errours of this Father, whoſe Authority you value more than that of God ſpeaking in the Holy Scriptures.

Of Prayer for the Dead, and of Purgatory.

Your Grace endeth your Allegations of Fathers with *Theodoret* and *Auſtin*. The firſt of which is alledged to ſay, *We believe that there is a Fire of Purgatory, in which Souls are purged like Gold in the Furnace.* The other ſaith, *He that will not till his Field, ſhall be chaſtiſed in this World, and after his Death ſhall be puniſht in the Fire of Hell, or in that of Purgatory.* And addeth, that he hath made a whole Book of the Prayers for the Dead, and that the whole Antiquity hath ſo practiced it.

They that have helped you with theſe Paſſages have miſerably abuſed your Grace. It is true, that all the ancient Church prayed for the Dead, but in a manner which the *Roman* Church condemneth, and holds to be ridiculous and erroneous. Not one Paſſage can be found in the genuine Works of any Father, by which it can appear, that he prayed for the Dead, to draw them out of Purgatory.

Could

Could Your Grace have the Patience to read St. *Auſtins* Book of the Care to be taken of the Dead, you would find that there is not one Word of Purgatory in the whole Book.

The Chriſtian Church in the III and IV Ages after Chriſt, prayed for the Saints, for the Apoſtles, and Martyrs. The publick Form of thoſe Prayers is found in the eighth Book of the Apoſtolick Conſtitutions of *Clement*, in the eighteenth Chapter. *We offer unto thee for all the Faithful which have been pleaſing unto thee from the Beginning of the World, Patriarchs, Prophets, Righteous, Apoſtles, Martyrs, Confeſſors.* The ſame is to be found in the Book of Eccleſiaſtick Hierarchy, that goes under the name of *Dionyſius*; and in *Epiphanius*, where he treateth of the Hereſie of *Arius*. All conſent, that none can imagine that theſe Prayers for the Saints, were to draw them out of Purgatory.

St. *Auſtin* who writ in the Beginning of the fifth Century, was the firſt that ſaid it was doing Injury to a Martyr to pray for him.

It further appears, that the ancient Church had not belief of this Doctrine, in that they prayed for the Souls that ſlept peaceably; which Prayer to this day remains in the *Roman* Maſs, in which the Prieſt prayeth for the dead in theſe Words; *Remember Lord thy Servants and Handmaids which are gone before us with the Sign of Faith, and which are ſleeping in a quiet Sleep.* It is evident, That this Prayer was made in a time when the Belief of Purgatory was not yet received, for thoſe that are burning (perhaps for many Ages) in a Fire ſeven times hotter than Hell, do not ſleep with a quiet Sleep.

If you ask me why they pray'd for the dead, whom they held not to be in any Torment, it will be no hard Matter to give you Satisfaction. Firſt they asked that the Dead Perſon for whom they pray'd might riſe again to Salvation in the laſt day. Such was the Prayer of *Judas Maccabæus*, 2 *Mac.* 12. *Doing therein* (ſaith the Author) *very well and honeſtly, in that he was mindful of the Reſurrection. For if he had not hoped that they that were ſlain* v. 43 & 44.

ſhould

ſhould have riſen again, it had been ſuperfluous and vain to pray for the Dead. By the Judgment of that Author, the Prayer made for the dead in the *Roman* Church, is ſuperfluous and vain, ſince it is not made for their Reſurrection. That this was in old time the intent of the *Roman* Church when they pray'd for the Dead, it appeareth by the Prayers which are uſed ſtill in the Maſs for the Dead, of which theſe are the Words; *We beſeech thee Lord to abſolve the Souls of thy Servants from all Bonds of Sin, that in the Glory of the Reſurrection, being riſen again, they may breath among the elected Saints.* Thus *Ambroſe* prayeth for the Soul of *Theodoſius*, and yet he ſaith, that he is received into Chriſt's Tabernacles in the heavenly *Jeruſalem.* And St. *Auſtin* prayeth for the Soul of his Mother *Monica*, which is among the Saints, and whom St. *Auſtin* believes to be enjoying heavenly Bleſſedneſs.

Another Opinion was riſe among the Antients, That ſome Souls ſhould riſe ſooner than other Souls, and that many Sins were to be expiated by the Delay of the Reſurrection. *Tertulli-*

an

an towards the end of his Book of the Soul, makes the Suffering of Souls after Death, even for the leaſt Sins to conſiſt in that Delay. In the Book of *Monogamy*, *chap.* 10. he will have a Widow to pray for her deceaſed Huſband, and that ſhe may keep him Company in the firſt Reſurrection. The like Prayer *Ambroſe* maketh for *Gratian* and *Valentinian*, *I beſeech thee O Supreme God, that thou wilt raiſe up again, more early, theſe moſt beloved young men.* Here is then a ſecond end, for which the Ancients prayed for the dead.

They had one end more. It was an Opinion generally held by the Fathers, that in the day of Judgment, after men are riſen again they ſhall not enter into Paradiſe before they have been ſindged and purged by the Fire of the day of Judgment, ſome more, ſome leſs, as they have more or leſs ſinned. This is the Purgatory Fire of the Antients, of which their Books are full. Through that fire they make all the Saints to paſs, even the Virgin *Mary*. *Lactantius lib.* 7. *cap.* 21. declares thus his Opinion, which was then the general, *When God hath judged the Juſt, he will try them by fire, and thoſe*

thoſe whoſe Sins are very conſiderable either in Weight or number, ſhall be ſindged and lightly burnt by the Fire. Thus *Hillary* upon St. *Matthew*, *To them that are baptized with Holy Ghoſt, it remains yet to be perfected by the fire of Judgment.* And in the part *Gimel* upon the 119 Pſalm, *This Purification is reſerved for us after the Baptiſm of Water, which muſt ſanctifie us by the coming of the Holy Ghoſt, and refine us by the Fire of Judgment?* Hilar. *in* Mat. *Canon.* 2.

Again, *Do we wiſh for the day of Judgment, in which we muſt paſs through that unwearied Fire, and undergo thoſe grievous Pains, to expiate the Soul of her Sins?* And he makes the Virgin *Mary* go through that Fire, *If* (ſaith he) *even that Virgin which hath conceived God muſt undergo the Severity of that Judgment, who will dare to deſire to be judged by God?*

St. *Ambroſe* alſo ſaith, that all the Prophets and Apoſtles muſt in that day be purged by that Fire. In the 20 Sermon upon the 118 *Pſal. All muſt paſs through the Flames, even* John *the Evangeliſt, whom the Lord loved, even* Peter. And upon the 36 *Pſal. The Sons of* Levi *ſhall be purged by Fire,* Ezekiel, Daniel, &c.

&c. Obſerve that he ſaith, *they ſhall be*; whence it appears, that he ſpeaks of a Fire which is not yet. St. *Auſtin* is expreſs for it in the 16 Book of the City of God, *chap.* 24. *By this Fire is underſtood the day of Judgment, which ſhall ſeparate the Carnal, ſome to be ſaved by the Fire, ſome to be condemned to the Fire.* And in the 25 Chap. of the 20 Book, *By that which was ſaid it ſeems to be evident, that in that Judgment there will be ſome Purgatory Pains*; And the Title of the chapter ſaith expreſly, that he ſpeaks of the Fire of the laſt Judgment. After the Purgation by that Fire, he holds that the Sentence of the laſt Judgment ſhall be pronounced, in the 21 Book *chap.* 16.

Of that Purgation by Fire ſpeak *Irenæus*, *Baſil*, *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Gregory Nyſſen*, and *Hierom.* It is of that Fire, My Lord, that *Theodoret* and *Auſtin* ſpeak in the places which you alledge. And it is one of the grounds, why the Ancients prayed for the dead. For that St. *Auſtin* believed that Souls going out of the Body, went ſtreight either into Paradiſe or into Hell, and that there is no middle or third place call-

ed

ed Purgatory: it is clear by theſe Paſſages, in the 18 Sermon of the words of the Apoſtle, *There are two Habitations, the one of the eternal Kingdom, the other of the eternal Fire.* And in the 232 Sermon, which is againſt Drunkenneſs. *Let none deceive himſelf, my Brethren, for there are two places and no third. He that hath not merited with Chriſt, ſhall periſh without doubt with the Devil.* And in the firſt Book of the merit of Sins and of Pardon, *ch.* 28. *There is no middle place, ſo that he that dwelleth not with Chriſt, can be any where elſe than with the Devil.* The fifth Book of the *Hypognoſticks* ſpeaks thus, *The Catholick Faith grounded upon Divine Authority, is, that the firſt place is the Kingdom of Heaven, and the ſecond is Hell. We believe no third place, and find none in the holy Scriptures.* In the Book of the Vanity of the World, chap. 1. *Know ye that when the Soul ſeparates from the Body, it is at the ſame Inſtant placed in Paradiſe for its good Works, or caſt down into the Gulf of Hell for its Sins.*

I could bring Your Grace Paſſages by hundreds out of the Fathers, which expreſs that the Souls of the godly are pre-

preſently after Death carried into Paradiſe or into Hell. I will content my ſelf with one or two.

Cyprian in the Book againſt *Demetrian* ſpeaks thus, *This temporal Life being ended, we are ſequeſtred either in the Habitation of Death, or in that of eternal Life.* And in the ſame place, *When men are gone from hence, there is no place left for Penitence, no Fruit, no effect of Satisfaction, and in Death it ſelf they paſs to Immortality.*

The Fathers were ſo far from believing that Souls were burnt in Purgatory, that many of them believed not that the Souls could be tormented without the Bodies. Thus *Tertullian* in the 48 Chap. of his Apologetick, *The Soul* (ſaith he) *cannot ſuffer without ſolid Matter, that is, without Fleſh* And *Gregory* in the Oration of the Lords Reſurrection, *The Fire can never work upon the ſeparate Soul, and Darkneſs cannot be grievous to it, becauſe it hath no Eyes.* *Ambroſe* in the firſt book of Penitence Chap. 17. *The Soul without the Body, and the Body without the Soul, cannot be Partakers of Puniſhment or Reward.*

Chry-

Chryſoſtom in the 39 Homily upon the firſt Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*. *The Soul without the Fleſh ſhall not receive her hiden Goods, as likewiſe ſhe ſhall not be puniſht without the Fleſh.*

The Truth is ſo ſtrong on our ſide, that many of our Adverſaries freely confeſs that the Fathers ſpeak little or not at all of Purgatory. *Navarrus* the Popes Penitentiary, in the beginning of the year of *Jubile*, ſaith, *No Orthodox doubteth that there is a Purgatory. Yet the Ancients make no mention of it, or very ſeldom*, and that he ſaith after *Roffenſis*, otherwiſe the Cardinal of *Rocheſter*, whom he alledgeth.

Alphonſus de Caſtro one of the Doctors of the Councel of *Trent*, in his eighth Book againſt Hereſies, upon the Word *Indulgentia*, ſpeaks thus. *In the ancient Writers, the mention of the Tranſubſtantiation of the Body of Chriſt is very rare, of the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt more rare yet, of the Purgatory they make almoſt no mention at all, eſpecially the Greek Authors; as alſo to this day the Greeks have not believed Purgatory.*

One may ſee in the Dialogues of *Gregory* the Firſt, That *Satan* in his

time was brewing that Myſtery by Viſions and Apparitions of Souls, ſome of which ſaid that they purged themſelves at the Smoak of Baths, others in the Wind, others in Rivers; and this was already in the year of our Lord 595.

But the Popes that came after, found out another kind of Purgatory wonderfully gainful, whereby they have heaped up to themſelves and their Clergy infinite Riches. For the Pope by Bulls and Indulgences fetcheth Souls out of Purgatory at the Suit of thoſe that will come to his Price to buy them, and particular Maſſes, whoſe number is infinite, are bought very dear, and none of them is ſung with particular Application to beggers or thoſe that have given nothing.

Yet they hold one Age to be exempted from Purgatory, for (ſay they) when Jeſus Chriſt cometh to judge the World, then all that live in the World ſhall be exempted from that Torment. In the mean while, one may wonder that whilſt Jeſus Chriſt is interceding for the Souls that are burning in that Fire (for he intercedeth for all the faithful) thoſe

Souls

Souls come not out by this Interceſſion, but by the Popes Indulgence.

By all that has been ſaid here, Your Grace may perceive how much you are miſtaken in the Fathers, and indeed, by your manner of alledging them, it is eaſie to ſee that you have not read them; but that ſome ignorant men furniſh you with Paſſages, which have quite another Senſe than that which they put upon them. If forſaking what you know from the holy Scripture, which (as St. *Paul* ſaith) is able to make us wiſe unto Salvation, you take thoſe things upon Truſt which others tell you out of the Fathers, and if you greedily embrace all that ſhall be preſented unto you of this kind, you will find enough to help your Reſolution, not to be ſeparated neither in this World, nor in the other, from my Lady, your Dutcheſs. You ſay that you would know the Grounds of her Religion, whilſt her Grace did not trouble her ſelf to know the Grounds of yours.

My Lord, how could that Thought come into your Mind, to believe Purgatory upon two or three Paſſages

of Fathers diſtorted from their right Senſe, and to ſhut your Eyes againſt all that the Word of God ſpeaks againſt it? Out of that good Word you might have learned, that *Bleſſed are they that dye in the Lord, that they reſt from their Labours, and that their Works follow them*; that *when the righteous dyeth he ſhall enter into Peace*: that we muſt *make to our ſelves Friends by Alms, which when we fail, may receive us into everlaſting Habitations*. That Jeſus Chriſt ſaid to the repenting Thief crucified with him, *This day thou ſhalt be with me in Paradiſe*. And yet by the Doctrine of the *Roman* Church, he had need of great Purgation. *That the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt the Son of God, cleanſeth us from all Sin*. This is our true Purgatory, God who is all juſt and all good, would he take two Payments for the ſame Debt, when the firſt Payment which is the death of Chriſt is ſufficient? would he delight to torment his Children for many Ages in an internal fire, for Sins which he hath freely pardoned, as we learn of St. *Paul*, that *God for Chriſts ſake hath forgiven us all our Treſpaſſes?*

Apoc. 14. 13.

Iſa. 57. 1. & 2.

Luke 16. 9.

Luke 23. 43.

1 *John.* 1. 7.

Eph. 4. 32.

Col. 2. 13.

Every

Every Father that chaſtiſeth his Children, unleſs he be altogether unnatural, doth it to make them better; but the *Roman* Church will have God to burn his Children, not to make them more righteous (for by their Doctrine they are perfectly righteous before they enter into Purgatory) but to content himſelf, and ſatisfie his Juſtice. Let them find if they can, one example in Scripture of any Soul that was ſent to Purgatory.

It is very conſiderable that in the Levitical Law there are Sacrifices preſcribed for all ſorts of Sin and Pollution, even of Leproſie and the touching of a dead body; but that Law preſcribes no Sacrifice for the dead, nor any Service for their Relief, yea, it oppoſeth it plainly; for he that brought unto the Temple or Sanctuary his firſt Fruits, Tithes and Offerings, to give Thanks unto God for his Income, and all the Crop of the Year, was commanded to proteſt that he *had not taken away ought thereof for any unclean uſe, nor given ought thereof for the dead.* *Deut.* 26. 12, & 14.

All theſe things, My Lord, drawn out of the Word of God, and founded upon

upon the Nature of the Goſpel, which the Son of God hath brought you from Heaven, are they not better than ſome Paſſages of the Fathers, which you alledge contrary to their Intention, and which ſay things that the *Roman* Church approveth not.

How comes it to paſs, My Lord, that ſince your Marriage you have taken another Rule for your Religion than the Word of God? You will be guided by the Fathers; but the Fathers ſend you back to the Scripture, and will not have you to reſt upon their Authority, acknowledging that they themſelves are ſubject to Errour. And for ſuch the *Roman* Church doth acknowledge them, and in a thouſand things find fault with them. Certainly the Holy Scripture without the help of mens Gloſſes hath light enough of its own to lead us to Salvation.

O! My Lord, it is dangerous to dally with God, and to bow the rule of his Word to the Will of another. As for My Lady Ducheſs your wife, I wonder not, that being nurſed in that Perſuaſion that her Religion is good, ſhe doth her utmoſt to draw you to it, think-

thinking thereby to do Service to God. Having no Inſtruction in the Word of God, her Grace doth that which ſhe thinks to be good; and I hope that God finally will be merciful to her. But you, My Lord, who have been carefully inſtructed in the Word of God, in whoſe Family God had planted his Covenant, whom God hath bleſt with ſo many effects of his Aſſiſtance, cannot but have a dreadful Account to give unto God.

I could alledge to Your Grace the memory of my Lord your Father, whom God had endowed with an incomparable Capacity; the Sorrow of your Lady Mother, whoſe Death you haſten by your Change; the Anguiſh of your neareſt Relations, and of all your Servants and Subjects, whom you fill with Confuſion; and the Inconvenience to your Affairs, which you do your ſelf acknowledge. I chooſe rather to exhort your Grace in the name of God, and as your moſt humble and faithful Servant, that you take pitty of your own Soul; and that at leaſt you delay the taking of that final Reſolution, till your Return unto this your Town, and till I may endeavour to ſhew to thoſe Doctors

ctors in your Preſence, that they abuſe your Grace with thoſe Paſſages of the Fathers, wherewith they have armed you. But I am ſure they dare not appear before me to maintain thoſe things which they infuſe into your mind. You have been many years harkning to them alone, without asking any of our Counſel or Aſſiſtance. Grant us at leaſt, that we may have ſome days to anſwer them.

I make no Doubt, but that by ſpeaking thus, I may looſe both your Graces and your Ladies Favour. But having but few days to live, I commit to God all that may come of it, and will endeavour to diſcharge my duty with a good Conſcience. Which I will always do without any Diminution of the Reſpect and Obedience which I owe to your Grace, and without intermitting my continual prayers to God for Your Grace, and for my Lady Dutcheſs, as being,

My Lord,

Your Graces moſt humble
and moſt obedient Servant.

PETER DU MOULIN.

FINIS.